

## REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated December 28, 2005. Claims 1, 2, 8, 10-16, 22, 24-30, 36, and 38-40 are presented for examination. Claims 1, 15, and 29, the independent claims, have been amended to define more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 1, 2, 8, 10-16, 22, 24-30, 36, and 38-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious from U.S. Patent 6,421,733 (*Tso et al.*) in view of "Request for Comments 1521: MIME (Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions) Part One" (*RFC 1521*).

A telephone interview was conducted by one of Applicant's attorneys with Examiner Neurauter on December 12, 2005 to discuss *Tso et al.* in view of *RFC 1521*. Specifically, *Tso et al.* was discussed regarding the limitations of storing parts of an e-mail that can be processed and deleting parts that cannot be processed. No agreement was reached. Applicant thanks Examiner Neurauter for his time spent discussing the references.

The present invention is intended to identify a data type of each part of a multi-part e-mail while the e-mail is being received by an apparatus and, when it is determined that the data type of a given part of the e-mail being received can be processed by the apparatus, that part of the e-mail is stored. See Fig. 2 and page 8, lines 19-22 of the present application, for example.

Claim 1 is directed to an e-mail processing method for controlling an apparatus. The method includes, first, identifying whether an e-mail is a multi-part e-mail

based on a header of the received e-mail while the apparatus is receiving the e-mail. The method also includes, second, identifying a data type of each part included in a text of the e-mail while the apparatus is receiving the e-mail, when it is identified that the received e-mail is a multi-part e-mail. The method further includes determining whether each part included in the e-mail can be processed, while the apparatus is receiving the e-mail, by comparing the identified data type of each part with a registered utilizable-data type. The method furthermore includes, based on that determination, (1) storing a part that can be processed, and (2) deleting a part that cannot be processed.

Notably, in the e-mail processing method of Claim 1, a data type of each part of a multi-part e-mail is identified while the e-mail is being received.

*Tso et al.*, has been discussed in previous papers, and therefore that discussion will only be repeated to the extent deemed necessary.

*Tso et al.*, as understood by Applicant, discusses types of information (e.g., so-called “data type-specific preferences” or “custom rules or programs for filtering/transcoding/processing data”) which may be used to dictate which of transcode service providers 24 are invoked. See column 7 of *Tso et al.*, for example. In the system of *Tso et al.*, a data stream is directed to the appropriate transcode service provider 24 after the data stream is received by parser 22 of transcoding server 34.

Applicant submits that nothing has been found in *Tso et al.* that would disclose or suggest identifying a data type of each part of a multi-part e-mail while the e-mail is being received by an apparatus and, when it is determined that the data type of a part of the e-mail being received can be processed by the apparatus, storing the part of the e-mail, as recited in claim 1.

In contradistinction to the method of Claim 1, *Tso et al.* discusses directing a data stream to an appropriate transcode service provider after the data stream is received by a parser of a transcoding server.

*RFC 1521*, as understood by Applicant, specifies an Internet standards track protocol for the Internet community, however, Applicant submits that nothing in *RFC 1521* would remedy the deficiencies of *Tso et al.* discussed above.

Accordingly, even if *RFC 1521* and *Tso et al.* are combined in the manner proposed by the Examiner or in any permissible combination (if any), the result would not meet the recitation of Claim 1.

For these reasons, Claim 1 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Tso et al.* and *RFC 1521*, either separately or in any permissible combination (if any).

Independent Claims 15 and 29 are apparatus and computer-readable storage medium claims, respectively, corresponding to method Claim 1, and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 1.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York Office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Leonard P. Diana  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No.: 29,296

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 566336v1